REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Re-examination and favorable reconsideration in light of the above amendment and the following comments are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 28 are pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1 – 15 stand rejected, and claims 16 – 28 stand withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

By the present amendment, claims 1 – 8 and 12 – 15 have been amended; claims 16 – 28 have been cancelled without prejudice; and new claim 29 has been added to the application. Applicants hereby reserve the right to file a divisional application to said claims and said non-elected invention.

In the office action mailed October 3, 2003, a restriction requirement between the following groups of invention is recorded:

I. Claims 1 – 15, drawn to a process, classified in class 216, subclass 2+; and

II. Claims 16 – 28, drawn to a composition, classified in class 252, subclass 79.1+.

Applicants hereby confirm the telephone election of the invention of group I, claims 1 – 15. Applicants however withdraw the telephonic traverse of the restriction requirement.

Claims 1 – 15 were rejected in said office action under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This objection has been mooted by the cancellation of the word "significant" from the preamble of claim 1.

Further in said office action, claims 1, 2, 5 – 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,844,859 to Roni; claims 1, 3 – 8, 10, 11, and 13 – 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,563,239 to Adinolfi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,217,569 to Hodgens, II et al.; claims 1, 3 – 11 and 13 – 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adinolfi et al. in view of Hodgens, II et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,556,449 to Nelson; and claims 1, 3 – 8, 10 – 15, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adinolfi et al. in view of Hodgens et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,936,316 to Gulla.

The foregoing rejections are traversed by the present response.

The present invention relates to a process for chemically milling a metal part comprising the steps of: preparing a milling solution containing nitric acid, hydrofluoric acid, dissolved

titanium, a wetting agent, and water; maintaining the milling solution at a temperature in the range of from 110 to 130°F; and immersing the metal part into the milling solution for a time sufficient to mill a desired depth on at least one surface of the part.

Claim 1 as amended herein is clearly allowable over the cited and applied references, taken alone or taken together. In particular, the claim as now presented calls for the step of preparing a milling solution containing nitric acid, hydrofluoric acid, dissolved titanium, a wetting agent, and water. None of the references cited and applied by the Examiner prepares a solution containing dissolved titanium and then immerses the metal part into the milling solution. The titanium which is present in the solutions of Roni, Hodgens II et al., and Adinolfi et al. only enters the solution as a result of the immersion of a titanium part in the solution during the milling operation.

Claims 2 – 15 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 and further on their own accord. With regard to claims 5 - 8, none of Roni, Hodgens II et al. and Adinolfi et al. teach the maintaining the dissolved titanium in the claimed amounts. With regard to claim 14, none of the references teaches or suggests adding palladium in the claimed amount.

With regard to the Nelson and Gulla patents, these references do not overcome the deficiencies of the Hodgens II et al. and Adinolfi et al. references. With regard to claim 12, Gulla does not teach or suggest adding urea to solutions of the type forming the milling solutions of the present invention.

New claim 29 is allowable because none of the cited and applied references, taken alone or collectively, teaches or suggests the steps set forth in the claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the instant application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe an additional amendment is needed to place the case in condition for allowance, she is hereby invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed to be due as a result of this response. Should the Commissioner determine that a fee is due, he is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 21-0279.

Respectfully submitted,

James O. Hansen et al.,

By _____

Barry L. Kelmachter
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Reg. No. 29,999
Attorney for Applicants

Telephone: (203)777-6628 ext. 112
Telefax: (203)865-0297
Email: kelmachterb@bachlap.com

Date: January 5, 2004

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on **January 5, 2004**.

_____
Nicole Motzer